

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/887,022	DE CONINCK, VALERE LEOPOLD, MARIE, PIER
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	N. Bhat	1761

**All Participants:**

(1) N. Bhat. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) K. Colton. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 19 May 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

20

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*The examiner asked to correct inadvertent typo in claim 20, to change "a" second occurrence to --an-- to read "...an agglomerated...." which was authorized by examiner's amendment.*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)